



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

compensation for this. The Gigantomachia was its traditional subject. Mayer holds that at this time the Parthenos herself was arrayed therein. Its decorative division in stripes afforded little play for innovation on the old types. On the other hand, to Pheidias must be ascribed the invention—almost required by the shape of the shield for the interior adornment of which he selected the familiar subject—of allowing the Giants to make a general assault on the Olympians from below. As the Lenormant statuette and the Strangford shield reproduce the combat of the Amazons with which the outside of the shield of the great ivory-and-gold statue was adorned, so at least one vase, a jar from Ruvo, now in Naples (Overbeck, *Atlas zur Kunstmythologie*, V 3), may give us some idea of the new effect attempted by the master mind of the Perikleian age. As to the Pergamene frieze, Mayer's observations will teach the replica-hunters to remember that the originals of copies are just as likely as not to be copies themselves. As his arrangement of the figures in the frieze, based on the wooden model used by the sculptor Freres in the Berlin Museum, cannot be considered final, we shall not follow it out in detail, but only observe that any placing of the slabs that does not recognize the intentional symmetry of the groups in which Zeus and Athena are respectively prominent fails to commend itself as reproducing the original order.

The typographical execution of the work is not what one expects of the established reputation of the publishing house, even assuming that the author himself was responsible for careless proof-reading. Such monstra as *täuschen* (for *täuschen*, p. 358), or *ἀνδρών* (p. 7), are by no means isolated.

Once, in the case of a bronze relief serving *ἀντὶ κρηπίδος τοῦ βουλευτηρίου* in Constantinople (Themist. Or. XIII, p. 217) we are treated to some archaeologists' Greek. "Die frage ist nur," says the author, "ὅβ ἐν τῇ κρηπίδι dastand, oder ob der sinnlich ansprechende u. technisch treffende begriff des Gegenlehens in dem überlieferten einen correcten ausdrück findet." As if *ἀντὶ* were not regularly equivalent to the Latin *pro* = *for*, *as*, or *als*!

ALFRED EMERSON.

Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus, dargestellt von Dr. WILHELM SCHMID.
Erster Band. Stuttgart, W. Kohlmeier, 1887.

In this book Dr. Schmid, a pupil of Rohde's, has taken up in successive chapters 'the principles that regulate the language and style of Dionysios of Halikarnassos,' 'the second sophistic down to Herodes Atticus,' 'the Atticism of Dion Chrysostomos,' and 'the Atticism of Lucian.' More than half the book is made up of lists of words arranged with reference to their character. So under Lucian we have Attic words, Platonic, Xenophontean, Hippokratean, words taken from the orators, poetic words, of which the comic vocabulary makes a special section, words found only in later authors, words used first or alone by Lucian, while regard is had to the occurrence or non-occurrence in N. T. Greek. For the material of this part of the work Schmid is naturally dependent on indices and lexicons, and the value of his sorting varies very much with the trustworthiness and amplitude of his sources. His analysis of Lucian's diction shows that what Lucian himself says (Bis Acc. II 834 R.) of

his works, that they are a combination of philosophic dialogue with comedy, is literally true in respect to the vocabulary, which is derived chiefly from three sources, Plato, Xenophon, and Attic comedy; but when Dr. Schmid takes up Dionysios of Halikarnassos, his remarks on the vocabulary and the grammar are of little importance. He has no Jacobitz to draw on, no Du Mesnil. And yet it must be said that some attempt to analyze vocabulary, tropology and syntax of at least the rhetorical works of Dionysios seems indispensable for the foundations of a work of which that rhetorician is the corner-stone. For most of his aesthetic judgments Schmid is dependent on Rohde, as might have been expected, but he has not always been careful to note the shifting of his master's views, and after coinciding with Rohde in accepting the Asinus as a genuine work of Lucian's, he has to record after the book is finished that Rohde has changed his mind. But this is only one sign among many that the book has not been thoroughly digested, and in every section we are called on to witness the gradual growth of the writer's knowledge, the gradual increase of his acquaintance with the literature, which, by the way, never becomes exhaustive. Why he should not have made himself familiar at an earlier date with Roeser's dissertation on the dual in Plato—which is of prime importance for one of his categories—is inconceivable. Why Kalker's treatise on Polybios, which appeared in Leipz. Stud. III, was reserved for the 'Zusätze' is another riddle. Similar gaps are to be found for the looking. So no notice is taken of Sturm on *πρίν*, of Weber on the final sentence, both of whom would have furnished him with categories for investigation, and no mention is made of Heller's interesting article on the final sentence in Lucian (1880). To many unfortunate Americans, who dare not stir until they have secured the last minuscule 'programme' from Krähwinkel, such a genial neglect on the part of a German will seem astounding. And yet, despite the tumultuousness and inequality of the work, one is glad to welcome to a neglected field a fresh and vigorous worker, and to all that Dr. Schmid says in commendation of Dionysios, of Dion, and of Lucian, those who are familiar with these authors will heartily respond. But Dionysios has long since been brought back to his rights by Blass, Dion has never lacked friends, and Lucian is a general favorite, so that the value of the book does not lie in the characteristics of these writers so much as in the detail work by which those characteristics are substantiated, and in the many proofs that Dr. Schmid has accumulated of the utter artificiality of the Greek of the whole period. When we sneer at *ἡ καθαρεύουσα* of our day, we dare not be too enthusiastic about the Renaissance of the Second Century. But as I have intimated above, as I have said elsewhere, almost the whole field lies fallow, and if Dr. Schmid has not been always careful in his tillage and betrays too often that he is a novice at the work, he has made a beginning in certain directions that will, it is to be hoped, have a good ending. The material for another volume is ready, he says. Every student of the period will welcome it when it comes, and welcome it the more heartily if the author profits by the manifold lapses and hastinesses of the present publication. A few notes jotted down in no unkindly spirit must close a notice that might be prolonged indefinitely if the critic's interest in the subject were the only norm.

P. 49. *οἱ περὸντες τῶν στρατιωτῶν*, which is perfectly normal, is paralleled with the abnormal *παλλὰ βελέων*, and the partitive construction is said to be

specially common in later writers ; but, p. 88, the discovery is made that the partitive genitive is pan-Hellenic and belongs to no period.—P. 92. *πάνν σπουδαιότατος* is cited as a curiosity from the schol. on Lucian, but, p. 238, *πάνν* with the superlative is enlarged on as a peculiarity of Lucian's. None of the examples cited (p. 95) for the third future show a decline in the sense, *εἰρήσεται* does not mean *ῥηθήσεται*, and the occurrence in certain verbs is in perfect accord with the meaning of those verbs. The old notion that metre had any considerable effect on the Attic usage cannot be defended. In So. Ai. 577: *τὰ δ' ἄλλα τεύχη κοῖν' ἐμοὶ τεθάψεται*, we might have *ταφήσεται*, but what a loss ! As for *ἔρεῖν*, Schmid is entirely too cautious (p. 96) when he speaks about the possibility that later writers may have taken the form for a present. There is no question about it, as Dr. Schmid might have seen by consulting Veitch s. v. See my note on Ep. ad Diogn. 2, 8: *ἔρεῖτε καὶ νομίζετε*, where *ἔρεῖτε* as a present is one of the ear-marks by which some wiseacres detected the hand of a forger. *ἔρεῖν* occurs as a present over and over in late Greek. So Dion. Hal. de admir. vi Dem. 54, p. 1119 R., Epictet. Diss. 2, 14, 1, and Aphthon. II 28, 5; 38, 12 (Sp.), to cite passages that happen to be at hand. Even in the classic period we have to ask ourselves whether *ἔρεῖν* is always felt as a fut., e. g. *ἔρεῖ* in Theogn. 492, Plat. Phaedo 102 D. On the familiar encroachment of *μή* on *οὐ* in later Greek Dr. Schmid sheds no new light. In the case of Dion he sees, with Blass, the influence of the mania for avoidance of hiatus in *ἐπεὶ μή* (p. 101) and *ὅτι μή*, but when he comes to Lucian this device fails him, and he falls back (p. 247) on Stegmann's confession of a like inability to set up any rule. Of the growth of the usage I have treated elsewhere (A. J. P. I 45), and I will only cite in confirmation of my stricture on a note in Geddes' Phaedo 63 B (A. J. P. VI 496), the passage of Dion to which Schmid has called attention (II 112, 1), and in which the indictment against Sokrates is quoted in the words of Xen. Mem. 1, 1 with the change of *οὐ* with participle into *μή*. The periphrasis *εἰμί* with the participle is lightly handled (p. 117), though even for later times it might have been worth while to study the categories of classic use. (See W. J. Alexander in A. J. P. IV 291.) And, admirable as Krüger's grammar is, we have later light on the use of the third person of the reflexive for the other two. See Bruno Keil's *Analecta Isocratea* as reported in A. J. P. VI 108. *ἔπου* as a realized *εἰ*, so to speak (p. 129), is common enough in the orators, whose use of it should have been noted.—P. 131. Schmid does not sufficiently take into account the sportiveness of Plato's use of *παῖδες*. While it is perfectly true (p. 172) that the so-called etymological figure is widely extended in all stages of Greek literature, it is also true that certain authors avoided it sedulously, as for example Isokrates (Blass, III 203). Is there, after all, any reasonable doubt as to the Atticism of *ἐφήσα* and its forms (p. 233), or are we to revise all our texts ? Rauchenstein, on Lys. 7, 22, questions *φήσας*, but *φήσας* occurs in Isokr. 12, 239, as Veitch notes, and *φήσαντες* in Dem. 54, 4: *φήσειε* occurs in so famous a speech as 18, 68. The ambiguity of *φάς* made the bifurcation into *φάσκων* and *φήσας* a practical necessity. See A. J. P. IV 161.—P. 235. Schmid cites the authority of Bernhardt (p. 119) for the assertion that the Lucianic *ὁ τὴν σύριγγα* is due to Herodotean influence. This seems to be a forcing of Bernhardt's language, who considers Lucian's phrases 'odd ellipses.' On p. 242 note that *οἶομαι* and *νομίζω* with *ὅτι* and *ὥς* do occur occasionally in classic Greek under

circumstances of special temptation, as when an antecedent precedes or the exact formula of the thought is given. So *οἶμαι τοῦτο ὅτι* Plat. Protag. 345 D; *νομίσαντες ὅτι* X. Hell. 5, 4, 62; *νομίζεν ὥς* Th. 3, 88, 3; cf. X. Cyr. 5, 4, 1; Eur. H. F. 298. Other verbs of thinking follow the same analogy. *οὐκ ἔτι* as a sympathetic *οὐ*, so to speak, is not a recent importation into the language, and (p. 247) some reference should have been made to early use. See Hermann's note on Pind. O 1, 5, and comp. also v. 114. As to *ὅτε μή* Krüger (Dial. 65, 5, 21) does not say that it occurs in Homer alone (p. 341), but only that it occurs in Homer. It occurs in so familiar a passage as Plat. Phaedo 84 E; cf. *ὁπότε μή* Rpb. 1, 354 C, and Laches 196 D. *δεῖ, χρή* and the like, says S. (p. 241), do not seem to occur in Attic syntax with the perf. inf. This statement he takes back in the 'Zusätze,' but he can hardly be forgiven, as the construction is notoriously Demosthenean. See Rehdantz Indices s. v. Infinitiv, and add 36, 13. 33; Plat. Legg. 949 E: *ἀνάγκη βεβουλεύεσθαι*; cf. also Hdt. 5, 18. But I forbear, having written enough to show that in the absence of better aids than we have now it is a dangerous pastime to write about Atticism at all.

B. L. G.

The Gospel according to St. Matthew, in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian versions, synoptically arranged, with collations exhibiting all the readings of all the MSS. A new edition. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press, by the Rev. WALTER W. SKEAT, Litt. D., LL. D. Edin., M. A. Oxon. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1887.

Those who have seen Prof. Skeat's editions of St. Mark, 1871, St. Luke, 1874, and St. John, 1878, are familiar with the plan of this edition of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.

It was undertaken by Kemble, but St. Matthew was not completed at the time of his death in 1857, and it was finished the next year by the Rev. C. Hardwick. The work was then postponed for several years, until Prof. Skeat took it in hand and edited the other Gospels as above stated. His reasons for re-editing St. Matthew may be briefly condensed as follows: 'In the former edition the mode of use of capital letters in the MSS was entirely ignored; so was the punctuation of the MSS and the contractions, and the accents of the MSS were sometimes retained and sometimes ignored: *v* and *j* were used in the printing, whereas the scribe of the Lindisfarne MS never uses them, "and, in fact, *j* was not used at all till the fifteenth century"; while the letters *p* and *ð* are used indifferently by the scribes of the A. S. versions, the printers of the former edition did not follow the MSS, but introduced still further variety.

The principles on which Prof. Skeat has worked may be briefly expressed in his own words: "To put it in the most striking manner, we may say that an editor's duty, at the present moment, is supposed to consist in an endeavour to represent the peculiarities of the MSS in the most exact and accurate manner; he is expected to assume that the scribes meant what they wrote, and he must not venture to make any correction without giving due notice." While this is carrying very far the worship of the letter, which may be but the blunder of an illiterate scribe, it is difficult to see on what other principles uniformity in editing MSS can be attained. Hence, Prof. Skeat has undertaken this work in order that his edition of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels may be uniform,